

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office action dated October 20, 2004, and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed.

By the above amendment, the abstract has been amended to overcome the objections raised by the examiner. No new matter has been added.

As a result of the Office action, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,503,244 to Beirlein. And, claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beirlein in view of EP0469475 to Albesiano. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed in any manner.

Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

By the above amendments, claims 1 and 2 have been canceled and new claim 6 has been added to better defined the claimed invention. New claim 6 includes substantially all the limitations of claims 1 and 2. No new matter has been added.

According to MPEP 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Moreover, according to MPEP 2143.03, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

Beirlein discloses a motorcycle provided with a stub-axle steering for the front wheel of the motorcycle. Contrary to the steering mechanisms suspended on the

head of the steering, the stub-axle allows the wheel steering components and the suspension/shock-absorbing components to be suspended on the main frame. The rear wheel, hence, does not instantly cooperate with the front wheel directional movements but there exists a time imbalance, long enough for the negative malalignment to appear. The Beirlein reference intends to reduce the construction height of the motorcycle while maintaining enough space for the spring deflection. However, the claimed invention is not intended to reduce the construction height of the motorcycle, but to prevent the malalignment of one wheel with respect to the other when the motorcycle is in motion.

The Albesiano reference teaches a front suspension for a motorcycle, however, this reference does not teach anything about addressing the negative malalignment issue of both wheels. The claimed invention is directed to a structural arrangement intended to prevent the negative malalignment between the front and the rear wheel which can bring about the imbalance of the motorcycle while in motion.

Moreover, the claimed invention's front module (3) is radically different from the module (30) of Albesiano.

The prior art references teach rear wheels that do not take part in the direct connection to the rotation axle but through the ends of the modules (5) in Beirlein and (30 or 17) in Albesiano, which bring about a displacement of the wheel axle whose length prevents the rear wheel from cooperating with the brusque movements of the front wheel and therefore giving rise to negative malalignment.

These shortcomings and problems of the prior art are exactly what the

claimed invention addresses, namely, by having a structural assembly in which the rear wheel axle is supported by the front wheel axle. Consequently, the rear wheel instantly cooperates with any changes in the direction of the front wheel, thereby preventing the malalignment of both wheels, which causes motorcycle falls when the motorcycle is in motion.

Moreover, the claimed invention allows for the lateral displacement of the front wheel, which likewise increases the likelihood that the rear wheel gets aligned with the front wheel despite the difficulties encountered on the surface that the motorcycle is traveling on.

The respective modules of Beirlein have neither the six sides of the die (3), nor pins (11, 11') alternated in position with ears (14, 14') of the module (3). Therefore, it is apparent that Beirlein teaches a solution to different problems from those solved by the claimed invention.

The flat, superposed and spaced-apart, projection arms (13, 13') of the inclined member (4) in holes (12, 12') in which pins (11, 11') are inserted, permit the pins (11, 11') along with the die (3) be inserted in the front wheel (2) rotation axle (1) bearing the die (3) with ears (14, 14') and holes (15, 15') to which the ends of the pull operating elements are connected, and that the rear wheel (8) by means of the rearwardly bent articulated arm (4) instantly cooperates with the movements to the right and to the left of the front wheel axle (1). Hence, any negative malalignment of the front wheel advance line with respect to the rear wheel is offset since the rear wheel is after all mounted on the same axle as that of the front wheel. In view of foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is patentable over the prior art.

Claims 3-5 are dependent from claim 6 and are therefore allowable for the reasons provided in connection with claim 6.

The prior art references made of record by the examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the newly added claim. It is noted that none of these references has been specifically applied by the examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office action dated October 20, 2004, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 3-6 are in condition for allowance.

Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD



By:

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16